G. R. S. IX-5]

*Previous references.*

Geol 156-15 (1-4)
" 5-18 (1 & 11
" 95-20 (1-4)
" 91-18 (1-8)

*Later references.*

~~Geol 62-21 (1-14)~~
" 43-22 (1-2)

Geol 30-26 (1-2)

192 1 .

( Geol )

File No. 71-21

Serial Nos 1-4

Previous

(16)

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

*Serial Nos.* 1-4

**Part B for** May 22

SUBJECT.

Granting mining lease to M. A. Ratchaiya Naidu & refusal to ~~gro~~ renew a prospecting licence held by Mr Venkatakrishnamma ~~&c~~ for mica over a block in Srirangapatam Taluk.

5039 B 27-3-22
5636 B 9-5-22

To the Director of Geol
Approves his recommend
re Mr -

WD 1888—GPB—16,826—23-7-21

-tus.

575

G. R. S. 11] 1921-22

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( Gool )

NOTES.

File No. 71-21

FILE HEADING.

Applications from Mrs Venkataseshamma & Mr. A. Pitchaiya Naidu for renewal of prospecting licence & grant of mining lease respecting over the Vadesamudra block in Serugapalam Taluk

From

The Director, Dept of Geology

| No. 1379 | Dated 23-2-22 | Received 25-2-22 |
|---|---|---|

| Diary No. 3959 | Enclos. | Spare Copies. | Serial No. 1 |
|---|---|---|---|

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Recommends for reasons stated that the applications received from Mrs Venkataseshamma for renewal of her licence, maybe rejected and that the grant of mining lease applied for by Mr. A Pitchaiya Naidu maybe sanctioned.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

Submitted with connected papers for orders.

Ans 2-3-22

The point for consideration is whether the application of Mrs Venkataseshamma for a renewal of her prospecting licence ought to be

NOTES—First Sheet.

3959

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Geo. File No. 71 of 1921.

Serial No.

late husband may be granted ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ the application rejected and a fresh ~~licence~~ mining lease granted to Mr Pichaya Naidu of a portion of the same block. It is reported that the work done by Mrs Venkatasubhamma through her agents is very unsatisfactory.

3 Previous correspondence shows that the block is a valuable one and that Mr Pichaya Naidu himself even before obtained the surface rights of land included in the block of which he was the owner to the husband of Mrs Venkatasubhamma. In this connection some irregularities on the part of Mr Pichaya Naidu came to notice at the time, though no definite action was taken against him. It is therefore not strange that Mr Pichaya Naidu should now again try to obtain a ~~licence~~ lease over the block.

4 It seems desirable therefore that neither Mrs Venkatasubhamma nor Mr Pichaya Naidu should grant a ~~licence~~ lease pending.

For orders

Mr 6/3/22

G. L. Leach 5/3

The Director may be asked how the surface rights have been granted. He recommends Pichaya Naidu

2nd member P.T.O.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

3855

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Geol File No. 71 of 1921.

Serial No.

4841-30
17.3.22

6

As regards Mrs Venkatasubhamma. I agree to the ~~proposal~~ suggestion that her application for renewal of license requires to be rejected, for the reasons given in the Director's letter under disposal. So far as his recommendation in favour of Pitchaiya Naidu is concerned I am afraid no good case has been made out. But before rejecting it an enquiry as proposed may be made.

Pkl

7 Ans. for ack
Sr 29/3
Mor 25/3

Submitted with a draft.

AHS
24-3-22
22/3/22

G. Odone
Mor 27/3

To The Director, Dept of Geology
5039 & 27-3-22
regrets the application of Mrs Venkatasubhamma for the renewal of the license, & invites attention to his letter of 6-10-19 bringing to light some irregularities on the part of Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu & enquires whether it is desirable to grant a mining lease to him over the area in question.

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

4552
3959

Geol File No. 71 of 1921.

Serial No.

3. From the Director, Dept of Geology
1662 & 8-4-22

Recommends for reasons stated that a mining lease may be granted to Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu over the area in question.

10

Submitted for orders. Reference paragraphs 3 to 6 above

AHS 12-4-22

12/4/22

It is for orders if in the light of the Director's present remarks a mining lease over a block of 160 acres comprising prospecting licence no 508 (since expired) held by Mrs Venkataseshamma ~~[illegible]~~ may be given to Mr Pitchaiya Naidu.

13.4.22

GL Seyd

A. In the circumstances I think that the Director's recommendation may be accepted

24/4/22

(St Brennan)

A. I agree

2.5.22

Issue orders accordingly

6000-6
1.5.22

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

4552 — 5
3757

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Genl File No. 71 of 1921.

| Serial No. | |
|---|---|
| | Submitted with a draft. |
| | Ans 5-5-22 |
| 4 | To the Director of Geology 5636 dt 9-5-22 |
| | Sanction the grant of the mining lease |
| B | |

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

34340

M. G. D. 12.

D 395 e, 6

No. 1379
Encs: 7.

Dated, Bangalore, 23/2/1922.

Geol 71-21-1

From

B. JAYA RAM, ESQUIRE, F.G.S.,
*Director, Mysore Geological Department.*

FEB 1922

To

S. Hiriannaiya, Esq., M.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to the correspondence ending with your office letter No.G.21885/Geol.95-20-4, dated 19th May 1921 conveying the sanction of Government to the renewal, for one year from the 16th January 1921, in the name of Mrs. Venkataseshamma, of Prospecting License No.508 for Mica held by her husband the late Mr. Yadala Chinna Venkatasubbiah Chetty over a block of one square mile of land in the Seringapatam Taluk, on the submission by the lady of a succession certificate in support of her title to her husband's property, I have the honor to state as follows:-

1. After repeated requisitions from this office a succession certificate, dated 14th October 1921, obtained from the Court of the District Judge, Cuddapah, was received from the lady with her letter, dated 25th December 1921, and the same is submitted herewith for the perusal of Government and kind return. The certificate relates to certain amounts due to her late husband, but there is no mention therein in regard to the rights and interests held by the late Mr. Chinna Venkatasubbiah Chetty under the license in question. It seems, therefore, to be a point for legal advice as to whether such a certificate

may be accepted and acted upon for the purpose of recognising the lady's title to succeed to such rights and interests.

2. Seeing that the period of one year for which the renewal of the license was sanctioned was to terminate on the 15th January 1922, Mrs.Venkataseshamma applied to this office on the 5th December 1921 (a few days before she forwarded the succession certificate in question to this office) for a further renewal of the license from the 16th January 1922. In connection with this application I beg to submit, for your perusal and kind return, the enclosed file of papers received from the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District, relating to certain irregularities on the part of the lady brought to light since the termination of the original period of the license. The irregularities relate to :-

(i) the continuance of work on the block for a period of six months even after the expiry of the term of the license;

(ii) conduct of the lady's Agent, one Mr. Abdul Quddus, in showing the Patel of Vadesamudram a false document as the renewed license, taking advantage of the illiteracy of the Patel;

(iii) false reports in the quarterly statements that no work was done after the expiry of the license;

(iv) illicit removal of two cart loads of mica in June '21.

The explanation offered by the lady in respect of the above irregularities is only that she is a widow, that she depended upon her clerks who played false and that she may be excused. Copies of the correspondence in the matter (this office letters Nos.56 and 1040, dated 11th July and 13th Decr. 1921, and the lady's letter, dated 25th December 1921) are also submitted herewith for the information of Government.

3. The explanation offered by the lady is by no means

satisfactory

satisfactory and I am inclined to think that she would be better advised to relinquish the block in her own interests and save herself from the duplicity of her Clerks and Agents. She resides in a distant place like Cuddapah and has shown herself incapable of managing the business satisfactorily.

4. There has also been lately received an application, dated 12th December 1921, for a mining lease for Mica over a block of 160 acres comprised within the Prospecting License No.508 under reference, from Mr. A.Pitchaiya Naidu of Mysore and a copy of the same is submitted herewith together with a copy of his letter of ~~the same date~~ 5th Jan 1922. Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu was the original holder of this block between 1916 and 1918 prior to its transfer to the late Mr. Chinna Venkatasubbiah Chetty by the grant of a fresh license. Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu has made Mysore his home for over 12 years past and has shown a fairly good amount of perseverance in dealing with mica blocks in the State.

5. Under these circumstances, I beg to recommend that Mrs. Venkataseshamma's application for the renewal of the license may be rejected and sanction of Government kindly accorded to the grant of a lease to Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu over the area applied for by him.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

B. Jagannath

Director,

Mysore Geological Department.

**FORM No. 5.**

APPLICATION FOR A MINING LEASE.

*Dated the* 12th *day of* December 1921

To

THE DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGY,
BANGALORE.

SIR,

I have the honor to apply for the grant of a mining lease to....work for Mica.....
.in the Seringapatam Taluk.....
under the rules contained in Notification No. G. 25838—Geol. 57-18-20, dated 12th May 1920 over the block of land containing.....160....acres marked on the enclosed extract from the Topographical Survey Map of Mysore.
~~Village maps of the Revenue Survey~~.

The block applied for comprises lands belonging to the villages, the names of which with the taluk and district to which each belongs, are set out in Schedule A hereto.

I enclose receipt from the Mysore Dist. Treasury for Rs. 100, the fee required in respect of this application.

The minerals in respect of which the lease is applied for are stated in Schedule B hereto.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,

Sd/ A. Pitchaiya Naidu

Name and address of applicant.
(Write legibly)
Pitchaiya Naidu
Proprietor,
Mica Mining Company,
Mysore.

**SCHEDULE A.**

| Village | Taluk. | District. |
|---|---|---|
| Udayasamudra | Seringapatam. | Mysore. |

State after the name of village, if whole or part only.

**SCHEDULE B.**

Minerals in respect of which the application is made.

ica.

"Copy"

WD 2022—GPB—100—16-7-20

B. Jagannath
Director,
Mysore Geological Deptt

Letter, dated 5th January 1922, from Mr. A. Pitchaiya Naidu, Proprietor, Mica Mining Company, Mysore, to the Director, Mysore Geological Department.

---

I beg to invite your kind attention to my application, dated 12th December 1921, for mining lease for mica over the Vadesamudram Block in the Sreerangapatam Taluk for which I have paid the necessar fee of rupees 100 and to request that the lease may kindly be granted to me at avery early date. I have been actively engaged in the mica business for the past fourteen years in the State of Mysore but for various reasons such as the great fluctuations in the market for mica, the occurrence of mica deposits in irregular patches in Mysore and in insignificantly small quantities in most areas, no profitable business could be developed by me so far. I have however made a careful study of the whole situation of the mica industry and the information gathered by me from different sources leads me to conclude that the prospects of a profitable business in mica are not altogether non-existent in Mysore and that the disappointing results obtained so far were largely due to the absence of skilled workers in Mysore For the business to be developed on proper lines it is essential that we should have in the first place abundant supplies of mica and secondly skilled men who can treat the mica so as to meet the requirements of the market, wasting as little quantity as possible in the processess of treatment. As you are aware, I have been devoting my whole life and time to mica business in Mysore and have spent several thousands of rupees with very little return. In fact I have been entirely depending upon this business for my progress in life and I beg therefore that you may be kind enough to give my case your most sympathetic consideration. It is my intention to start local manufacturers in the Mysore City such as mica splittings, mica knots, mica chimneys of numerous beautiful patterns and designs, etc. and I shall be very grateful to you if you will kindly grant me the mining lease for over the Vadesamudram Block, as well as a monopoly for mica over the Mysore and Hassan Districts.

The

The late licensee of the Vadesamudra Block was a non-Mysorean and has also died since. His widow, residing at Cuddappah, can hardly be expected to work the Block satisfactorily and I hear that her agents removed large quantities of mica unauthorisedly as already brought to your notice. I was also the original holder of that Block and it is I, that spent large sums of money and proved it to be valuable, notwithstanding the discouraging results obtained by previous lessees such as the Bombay Mining Syndicate, etc. The grant of this block to me will enable me to develop the mica industry in the Sta[illegible] proper business lives and I beg that you may be kind enough to recommend the lease of the same to me.

---

Copy.

B. Jayaram

Director,
Mysore Geological Department.

C.R.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

ab

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*.....

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 27.3.22

Signed by Mr. M. S. R. Dutt

Section Geol.
File No. 71-21
Serial No 2

No. 5039

To The Director, Dept of Geology
Sir
With reference to your letter no 1379 Dy 23-2-22, I am directed to state that under the circumstances represented Govt are pleased to direct that the application of Mrs Venkata Lakshamma for the renewal of prospecting license no 508 for mica over a block of land in the Seringapatam Taluk be rejected.

As regards the application of Mr. A. Pitchaiya Naidu for a mining ~~mica~~ lease over the block, I am to

over.

P.T.O.

invite your attention to your letter no 951 of 6-10-19 bringing to light some irregularities on his part and to enquire whether in circumstances therein referred to it is desirable to grant a mining lease to him over the area in question.

I have etc.

2nd Accountant

Mr 22/3/22

Possibly not [illegible]

[illegible] 22/3/22

List of enclosures.
one file

Copied by

Examined by

49873

M. G. D. 12.

No. 1662

Geol 71-21-3

Dated, Bangalore, 8/4/22

14

GEN & REV. SE... 10 APR 1922

From

B. JAYA RAM, Esquire, F.G.S.,
*Director, Mysore Geological Department.*

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT 10 APR 1922 INDUSTRIES & COMMERCE BRANCH.

To

S. Hiriannaiya, Esqr., M.A., B.L.,
General Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

In reply to para 2 of your letter No.I.C.5039/Geol. 71-21-2, dated 27th March 1922, enquiring whether, in spite of the irregularities on the part of Mr. A. Pitchaiya Naidu mentioned in this office letter No.951, dated 6th October 1919, it is desirable to grant him a Mining Lease for Mica over the Udayasamudram Block in the Seringapatam Taluk comprised in prospecting license No.508, I have the honour to state that the irregularity mentioned in the aforesaid letter of 6th October 1919, relates to the sale by the late Mr. Venkatasubbiah Chetty of 38 cases of Mica collected during the currency of Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu's prospecting license No.436 which expired on the 1st of May 1918. The irregularity lay in the fact that the Mica was removed and sold after the date of the termination of the prospecting license and without any renewed or fresh license. The removal was made by Mr. Venkatasubbiah Chetty who had accepted responsibility for the payment of royalty due thereon (vide para 4 of Dr. W. F. Smeeth's letter No.2354, dated 22nd February 1919). The sale of Mica by Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu to Mr. Venkatasubbiah Chetty can hardly be construed as an offence or irregularity, especially as Mr. Venkatasubbiah Chetty accepted responsibility to pay the royalty

15



due on the Mica.

2. There are very few prospectors interested in Mica at present in Mysore and of them Mr. Pitchaiya Naidu appears to be the most persistent man. It seems, therefore, to be very desirable that he should be granted the Mining Lease already recommended in para 5 of my letter, No.1379, dated 23rd February 1922.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

B. Fayen Rao

Director,

Mysore Geological Department.

MVH/

ale
B

16

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

*Diary No. of letter replied to*.....

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* *191* .

Date of issue 9. 5. 1922

Signed by [illegible]

Section Geol
File No. 71-21.
Serial No 4

No. 5636

To

The Director, Dept of Geology

Sir,

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter no 1662 dt 8-4-22 I am directed to convey, under the circumstances represented, the sanction of Govt to the grant of a mining lease to Mr. A. Pichaiya Naidu for mica over a block of 16 acres of land comprised in the Udayasamudram block in the Seringapatam Taluk.

Thereafter

6/5/22 for Secy to Govt, Genl

over.

6/5/22